G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000—22-7-14

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1906-07
~~191~~ .
(Madras)

File No. 472

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

*Month*_____

SUBJECT.

Complaint of Holavanahalli Katte Krishnachar against the Examiners of the Sanskrit Vidwat Examinations held in 1906.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES LATER REFERENCES

Muz 8] 190 .

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

OFFICE NOTE.

File No.

SUBJECT.

Sanskrit Vidwat Examinations held in 1906.

From

Holavanahalli Katte Krishna Char

Petition No. Dated 26th September 1906.

The accompanying report from the President of the Sanskrit College Committee clearly explains why the petitioner was declared as having failed. He has utterly failed as will be seen from the marks obtained, but he complained to me in person that such low marks were assigned owing to the Zid of one of the examiners against his tutor. Such allegations cannot, in my humble opinion, be taken notice of by Government. I think an Endorsement may be given to the Petitioner stating that it has been reported by the Committee that the Petitioner obtained very low marks in each one of the question papers set to him that he utterly failed in two papers obtaining 10 marks less than the minimum in each case, and that

File No. of Muzrai Secretariat.

he fell short of the total prescribed minimum by 52 marks and that under such circumstances the Government consider that he has been rightly declared as having failed and that they cannot pass any orders for re-valuing his answer papers.

Submitted to the II Councillor.

Illegible
28/9/06

Returns may be rejected - the allegations are unfounded
KVN
28/9/06

Draft submitted
Ks
28/9/06

No 1828 dpt 26.9.06
Encl: one.

Encl

To

The President
H. H. the Maharaja's
Sanskrit College
Committee, Mysore

Sir,

I am directed to
forward herewith Mr.
No. B. of his dated, received from
Holenarasipur Kutta Krishnachar,
one of the candidates
who appeared for the
Vidwat Examination
in Advita Vedanta
lastem this year
alleging certain irregu-
-larities on the part
of the Examiners

2. I am to request that you will be good enough to report in what subjects the petitioner has failed and by how many marks and ~~who~~ if there are any grounds to consider the allegations made by him —

3. It should also be reported whether, as alleged in the petition, one of the ~~passed~~ candidates who passed this is the son of an examiner in ~~said~~ your the same centre in which the former appeared whether the ~~Bathoo Court~~ said examiner valued the answer papers of his own son, and if so, whether the committee were aware of the circumstances when they submitted

this

recommendations
to Government
nominating him as
an examiner in Dwelling
Vernacular section.

The favour of an
early reply is requested

I have the

26/9/06

Secretary
Mysore Dept.

26/9/06
Mysore -

(General Serial No 30.)

1906.

From B. Ramakrishna Rao Esq.
President, Managing Committee
Maharajas Sanskrit College
Mysore

To L. Anantasami Rao Esq B.A.
Muzrai Secretary.
Camp Mysore.

Dated 27th September 1906

Despatched

Received

Enclosure No. one.

General No. 11
No.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 1828 dated 26th instant forwarding for report the petition of Katte Krishnachar, a candidate for the Vidwat examination in Dvaita Vedanta, I have the honour to state that the allegations contained in the petition are quite unfounded. The petitioner appeared for part II of the Dvaita-Vedanta namely the Sutra-bhashya. The examination in this part was conducted both in writing and viva-voce and his marks are as follows.

	maximum	minimum required to pass	marks obtained
In the 1st paper.	80.	40 P.C. = 32	33
2nd paper	80	32	39
3rd paper	100	40	30
4th paper	80	32	33
5th paper	60	24.	14
(X) Viva-Voce.	100	40 ..	49.
(X) Total	500	50 P.C. 250	198

The Minimum for a pass

in this part being 250 marks i.e 50 per cent of the total, he was failed for want of 52 marks, which is far wide of the margin. The five papers were distributed among four different examiners respectable and reliable, as per margin, Pandit R Raghavendrachar being assigned only one paper

1. Srimushnam Gopala Krishnachar
2 Punganoor R Raghavendrachar
3. Mayakonda Krishnachar.
4. Vyakarana Venkataramanachar

The Viva Voce portion was conducted by three examiners who valued ~~each~~ the answers quite independently of each other. It will thus be seen that every precaution has been taken to make the test fair and equitable.

As regards the allegation that one of the Candidates was examined by his own father &c, I beg to state that the petitioner gives no names, in the absence of which it is not clear what he alludes to. One Srinivasachar, son of one of the examiners by name Venkataramanachar, was a Candidate; but his father bore no share in the examination in the part in which the boy appeared. The Dvaita Vedanta teacher in the College was allowed to take no part in the examination this time in Vedanta.

It may be added that one Krishnachar of Pavagada a student of the Maharaja's Sanskrit College Mysore, who like petitioner failed in two out of five papers but got more marks than he in Viva-Voce, scored on the whole 248 marks. He failed by but two marks.

The petition under reference is herewith returned.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

M Ramakrishnaiah
27-9-06
President.

Document No. 13

No. 1909. dt/28.9.06

1910.

Confidential

D. No. 17

Bangalore
26 Oct 06

Dear Sir,

One Mr Holuvanhalli Krishnachar, whom you perhaps know, represented to the Dewan the other day that certain examiners at the late Vidwat examinations were prejudiced against him & purposely blocked him, ~~Hand~~ and

they declared certain
persons to have passed
who are admittedly
inferior to him in ability
The allegations are
serious & he says that
their truth can be
seen if the several
answer papers of
both candidates
sent for and
by impartial persons

The Dewan would like to know what you think of these statements and whether there are any sufficient reasons to make any enquiry in the matter by sending for the papers &c.

Yours Sincerely

C Balasundaram

Dear Mr. Balasundara Ayyar

In reply to your DO
I beg to submit an Office
Note on the subject.

Yrs sincerely
V. Ananta Lakshmi Rao

7/11/06

The Dewan thinks
that no action
is necessary

12/11/06 14/11/06 C.S.B. 20/11/06

Confidential

204

[illegible] D.O. dated 20th October 1905.

25-92

In reply to my D.O. third above, I beg to state that the petitioner had brought a complaint of unfairness on the part of the Examiners in dealing with his answer papers in the Vidwat Examinations this year, when the results of the Vidwat Examinations were about to be announced in September last. I called for a report from the President (Mr.B.Ramakrishna Rao) of the Committee of the Maharaja's Sanskrit College, Mysore, and from his reply (No.11 dated 27th October 1905) it appeared that the petitioner had obtained very low marks in each one of the 5 question papers set to him, that he utterly failed in 3 papers obtaining 10 marks less than the minimum in each case and that he fell short of the total prescribed minimum of 250 marks by 52 marks. The President further reported that every precaution was taken to render the examination fair and equitable.

With the 2nd Councillor's approval, orders were issued rejecting the petitioner's complaint, and stating that he had been rightly declared to have failed in the examination.

I was of the humble opinion that the allegations made by the petitioner that <u>mid</u> existed between one of the ex-

named Royapalyam Raghavendrachar and the petitioner's pleader named Gowdagiri Venkatramanachar and that this led to unfair-ness in valuing the answer papers should, as a matter of principle, not be taken notice of by Govt, and the Councillor was pleased to agree with me.

The matter appears to have been once pressed upon the attention of the Dewan by the petitioner and his tutor/Gowdagere Venkatramanachar. I spoke to the latter when he came to represent the matter to me, and told him that he was making serious allegations against the honesty of a number of respectable and highly educated gentlemen who were appointed as Examiners by Govt and that, in case his allegations were found not to be borne out by facts, the consequences to himself in loss of prestige and reputation would be very serious. He however still persisted in his assertions.

About 2 years ago, there was somewhat similar case. In it, the candidate named Anekal Srinivasachar obtained very low marks and was plucked in the paper set by Gowdagere Venkataramanachar. But the Committee re-valued the answers and declared him as having passed. As the candidate had obtained very high marks in the other subjects, he was given a place in the 1st class. Gowdagere Venkataramanachar having subsequently complained of the Committee having interfered with the marks given by him, the late Dewan called for the answer papers, and

[illegible] the

[illegible]

[illegible] the question

[illegible] in

the case of the present [illegible]

Examiners [illegible] proposed

in them. With this view, I [illegible] D.O. cor-

fidentially to Mr. Ramachandra Rao, Principal of the Mysore Sans-

krit College Committee, requesting him to send [illegible] sealed cover, all the question and answer papers of the several candidates who appeared for the Dvitia Varsha Examination in August (Bhadrapada) last. After receipt, they may be ~~returned~~ referred for valuation to some gentleman who knows the subject and who is unconnected with the contending parties in this case.

Submitted to the Dewan in

reply to his query dated 26th October 1906.

T Ramakrishna Rao

7/11/06

2800/1
8.11.06